



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

templation ; but we recommend them to the attention of archæologists. The author sums up his statement thus :—

“ . . . Since the era of that tranquil, uniform, and general subsidence, which resulted in the submergence of the forests, whose remains are found on the strands of all the British seas and channels, thick accumulations have been lodged in the valleys or the forest ground, and broad foreshores have been formed by the retreat of the cliffs before the waves, yet, at least, nineteen centuries have failed to produce an appreciable change in the character of the mount, or its relation to the mainland ; prior to this subsidence was the period of the forest growth, when the mount was unquestionably a ‘hoar rock in a wood,’ but which, in all probability, it had ceased to be very long before any language now known to philologists was spoken in the district ; before this again was the period of the deposition of the blue clay and of the tin-ground, in which the forests grew ; earlier still was the epoch of the excavation, or re-excavation of the valleys, in whose boundary hills are the caverns of South Devon ; and in a still more remote antiquity, when the bottoms of the valleys were, at least, one hundred feet above their present levels, persistent streams or fitful land-floods carried the characteristic red loam into these caverns. Great as is the age of these deposits of cave-earth, it does not exceed the antiquity of man in the south-west of England.”

THE ORIGIN OF THE GAULS.*

THE appearance of M. de Belloguet's work calls somewhat painfully to mind the fact that anthropological studies are regarded with far more favour in France than in England. M. Amédée Thierry's *Histoire des Gaulois* has already attained a sixth edition. The volume before us is the third part of a work which can already boast a second edition of its first part, and that first presents no more attractive title than *Glossaire Gaulois*. The writings of Dr. Broca and M. Pouchet are probably better known in France than those of any English anthropologist in England. And, though some English anthropological publications exist of which Englishmen may be proud, it would be difficult to point out one of which the first edition has been fairly sold out.

To us, therefore, on this side of the channel it seems somewhat strange when a Frenchman complains of the difficulty with which new and more correct views are adopted. M. Belloguet laments that

* *Ethnogénie Gauloise*, par Roget Bon. de Belloguet. Troisième partie,—“Le Génie Gaulois.”

proofs drawn from history and from science are ignored in the latest editions of popular works, and plagiarist after plagiarist repeats the errors of his predecessors. His indignation is excited because M. Amédée Thierry still recognises a distinction between the Gael and the Cymry. What would he say if he lived in England and saw a work (brought out under the auspices of Oxford University) of which the first volume reiterates again and again, in defiance of historical criticism and physical facts, the astounding statement that Englishmen are Dutchmen?

In France matters are certainly better understood, because they have been longer and more carefully studied. Although the French are separated from the Germans by no more formidable barrier than the Rhine, Frenchmen of all ranks are quite satisfied that they are not of Teutonic origin. Though Britain is separated from Germany by the sea, there are still many Englishmen who believe that a few marauders from Jutland and Holstein have sufficed to people nearly the whole of Great Britain. So far as names are concerned, France and England are on the same footing, for each has adopted the name of a German tribe. In England, however, *littérateurs* and historians have fallen down and worshipped the word as a god; and only scientific inquirers are at present convinced that the word is in no degree an indication of the fact. In France, on the contrary, common sense, if not a more diffused knowledge of science, has impressed upon the national mind the conviction that great races are not annihilated by invasion. In spite of his name, and in spite of his language, the Frenchman never dreams that he is either a Roman or a Frank. He admits that both the Romans and the Franks have had an influence upon his history, but he prides himself on being what he knows that is, a Gaul by descent.

The application of anthropology to minor race problems affecting the inhabitants of France is thus rendered far easier than its application to similar problems in England. Here we still have to struggle for the establishment of first principles; there first principles, which have received the sanction of anthropologists, are firmly implanted in the public mind; and while we are labouring (not without success, it is true) to prove that if race means anything it means radical distinction between Germans and Englishmen, our French friends can limit their inquiries to the constitution of that Gallic nation which Cæsar subdued.

M. de Belloguet entertains, or rather appears at first sight to entertain, an opinion wholly different from those of Messrs. A. Thierry, Edwards, and Broca, concerning the signification of the term Celt. He regards the true Celts or Gauls as a race spread at various times over

a very wide area—from the British Isles to the mouths of the Danube—and characterised everywhere by “a milk-white skin, a lofty stature, a long face, and very fair hair.” He repudiates the distinction commonly drawn between the Gael and the Cymry, and admits only one Celtic people, which, according to his view, subjugated a round-headed brown race, previously master of Gaul, by whom the Celts were, to a great extent, absorbed. All who are acquainted with the writings of Dr. Broca, the great master of French anthropology, will remember that to this short-headed brown race, which still survives almost pure in Auvergne, he gives the name of Celts as distinguished from the tall long-headed and somewhat fair-haired race whom he distinguishes by the name Cymry. So far as the Cymry are concerned, he agrees with M. Amédée Thierry and M. Edwards, from whom, however, he differs in making Celt a term of special, instead of generic, meaning. And it is not too much to say that all these unfortunate differences have arisen from the old-fashioned and pernicious theory that language and race are always cœxtensive. The war is a war, not of facts, but of words.

It is quite possible that M. de Belloguet, M. Thierry, M. Edwards, and Dr. Broca may all be perfectly right—much as they seem to differ from each other. M. de Belloguet, as we understand him, asserts that the long-headed race, which he says was fair-haired, spoke a Celtic dialect; the other authors do not dispute the position. M. Thierry, discovering certain marked differences between the High and the Low Celtic dialects, assumes a corresponding difference of race; but even M. de Belloguet cannot deny that the linguistic differences exist. M. Edwards does but draw the distinction between the long-headed and the short-headed races; and M. de Belloguet admits the distinction, though he cannot agree with M. Thierry's nomenclature. Dr. Broca boldly denies the value of philology in questions of race, gives an arbitrary definition to his terms, and when given maintains it consistently; but his facts agree with the facts of the other three authors. It appears from all this, that an international anthropological congress is very much needed to settle with authority the sense in which ethnic and other terms should be used. There is great waste of valuable force in these disputes which might be rendered impossible by common consent.

A man must be very bigoted who would refuse to abandon his own definition, however correct in his opinion, for the sake of uniformity; and until some definite understanding has been arrived at, each author who does not wish to fall behind the age would do well to define his own terms. It may be that the words Cymry, Celt, Gael, etc., will have to be abandoned one day by scientific anthropologists, and will become the mere playthings of third-rate anthropological philologists;

it will probably be found impossible in practice to disconnect the terms from some of their old associations. They must always be used to distinguish languages, and their use in anthropology will, therefore, always have a tendency to confuse language with race. Should M. de Belloguet's work have the effect of producing such a change, he will have been a very great benefactor to science.

So far as the leading facts are concerned, it does not appear that M. de Belloguet has brought to light very much that was not previously known to English anthropologists. M. de Belloguet's great point, however, is that the short-headed race which forms the chief constituent element in the Gallic nation, is to be identified with the *Ligures* of classical writers, with the "*Lloegrwys*" of the Welsh triads, and with the *Gwyddil*, *Gaedhail*, or *Gaels*. "We claim," he says, "the honour of having first presented them to the world of *savans* as the true root of our genealogical tree, by distinguishing them from the Iberians, with whom the ancients had confounded them, and who are, like the Celts, grafted in the west, on their prehistoric trunk." This Ligurian people M. de Belloguet believes to have been sober, accustomed to labour, well able to bear fatigue and privations, warlike, and remarkable for their courage. They were accused of perfidy and cruelty; but their two best marked characteristics were cunning and an indomitable obstinacy. They were at all times avaricious, and in war eager for pillage. They possessed quickness of perception, great natural eloquence, a keen sense of the ridiculous, a restless spirit of inquiry, and the faculties of invention and imitation. On the other hand, they were wanting, says M. de Belloguet, in "the religious sense," though, according to Cæsar, the whole of the Gauls were plunged in the most revolting superstitions.

This description naturally excites the inquiry—how is it possible to distinguish the character of the Ligurians from that of the dominant caste, the Gauls, if such a caste ever existed? A strict application of the principles of historical criticism compels us to pause before accepting M. de Belloguet's picture as an authentic portrait, though the same principle forbids us to assert that the portrait may not be correct. The truth is, that there is but little historical material in the writings of the Greeks and Romans, by means of which it is possible to draw even an outline of the character of any very ancient people considered as a whole, except, of course, of the Greeks and Romans themselves. And there is still less material for an analysis of the psychological characteristics of the component elements of any very ancient people. In the present case an attempt has been made to distinguish the Ligurians from the Gauls proper upon the most slender possible evidence. A few vague allusions from some of the poets, the notes of a commentator,

and the superficial remarks of one or two travellers may be given as the catalogue of authorities upon which the author relies, and which certainly appears to be quite insufficient for his purpose.

It would, however, be unjust to M. Belloguet to represent him as insensible to the difficulties which beset him on every side from want of materials. He is perfectly aware of the delicacy of his task, and endeavours to strengthen his position by those "considerations of general ethnology," which he has stated in the previous parts of his work. And he believes that the contradictions of various ancient writers upon the manners and customs of the Gauls considered as a nation are only to be explained by his hypothesis concerning the two component elements. Having assigned certain mental and moral qualities to the Ligurians, he assigns certain others to the Gauls proper according to his nomenclature—to the conquering race. The latter, though remarkable for beauty of form and feature, were, in his opinion, characterised by a fierce and impetuous love of action, by the want of reflection and fiery energy of the brute, by intemperance, and by a passion for ornament—qualities hardly redeemed by a certain simplicity and frankness, by credulity, and by a magnificent hospitality. It would require more proof than M. de Belloguet can adduce to convince the majority of men that nearly all the worst mental manifestations were exhibited by the race of better *physique* and nearly all the best manifestations by the race of worse *physique*.

All attempts to distinguish races by their psychical characteristics are dangerous even when the evidence appears to be ample and the differences well marked. There is a great tendency in this, as in many other subjects, to mistake words of little or of ambiguous meaning for facts of great importance. Take, for instance, such terms as "quickness of perception," "warlike disposition," "sense of religion," and consider what they may imply, according to the different views of different persons. They may mean almost anything, or next to nothing. Quickness of perception may be applied to a woman's eye for her neighbour's dress, or a man's generalisation of scientific facts. The definition of a warlike disposition must of necessity differ with the age which is under consideration, and the point of view from which it is regarded. The "religious sense" is, perhaps, the most unfortunate term which could be chosen for the discrimination of races. From different points of view it would be possible to maintain that any nation possesses a religious sense, or that any nation is without it. To the bigot nothing is a religious sense except that kind of sense which causes other men to think as he thinks himself. To the student of religion in general—of the sum of the religious manifestations in the world—there appears to be, if not a religious sense (which is too vague

an expression for scientific use), at least a common element of mind which causes human beings, however differently constituted in other respects, to accept a religious belief of some kind or other.

It appears without doubt, at first sight, to be a matter of little difficulty to describe the mental characteristics of any nation, or at least their salient features. But this is a branch of study, which, if it can be safely undertaken by anyone, can be safely undertaken only by a psychologist; and psychology is by no means the easiest of the sciences. Popular language may be very useful for an appeal to popular feelings, but scientific accuracy is not to be attained without the use of technical terms. Nothing is added to our knowledge when the character of a nation, or even of an individual, is given by a string of ambiguous adjectives. That kind of methodless ethnographical psychology is fit only for the Calibans of literature or the Plagiaries of science; and it is not desirable in the interests of anthropology, that the scientific world should be peopled either with Plagiaries or with Calibans.

Either ignorance or a deliberate disregard of admitted psychological laws would be excusable only if greater precision could be attained by the adoption of some new method. The discovery of the laws of association which have now been recognised by psychologists of every school, the works of Professor Bain, of Mr. Herbert Spencer, of Mr. G. H. Lewes, and of Professor Masson, have not been thought worthy of notice by M. de Belloguet, nor is there any trace of scientific method in *Le Génie Gaulois*. Psychology there is; but it is the psychology of the *littérateur*, not of the psychologist.

This literary superficial mode of treating mental phenomena throws over every proposition a haze which is not to be penetrated by the scientific eye. Thus, we not only have descriptions of character which would be almost equally applicable to a modern Eskimo and an ancient Greek, but we have endless repetitions in various forms of the old-fashioned jargon concerning the recognition of "A Higher Power." In one place we are told that a tribe is wanting in "the religious sense;" in another that "a sentiment, more or less instinctive, led the first Aryans to recognise above their heads a Supreme Author of all things, a general and omnipotent principle of existence." It would, perhaps, be impossible to invent a sentence which would more obviously display the absence of all psychological training than that which has just been quoted. Where could anyone hope to discover a more exquisite contrast than that which exists between the extreme vagueness of the "general omnipotent principle of existence," and the extreme precision with which the "general principle" has its place assigned "above the heads" of the first Aryans? Whatever may be the

true definition of instinct, it is quite certain that the instinct of brutes would be of very little use to them, did it not enable them to discover facts very much more definite than general and omnipotent principles.

But all this comes of attaching too much importance to words. It is only what might be expected of an author who announces that the language of the Celts "proves" their eastern origin. It is the fault not of intellect but of a mischievous training in old-fashioned prejudices. Though we have not spoken in terms of very high praise concerning the third volume of M. de Belloguet's work, we nevertheless entertain a high respect for M. de Belloguet himself. His faults are the faults of the pernicious literary system which he has adopted, or in which he has been reared ; but his merits are all his own. He is credulous in historical matters, he is blindly partial to the philological school of ethnology, but he is a man of rare erudition, and when he does not start with a foregone conclusion he shows powers of criticism and of combination which might have rendered his book a masterpiece.

He is well acquainted with the works of Adalbert Kuhn, and of Max Müller, and he criticises, while he adopts, some of their views on comparative mythology. Here again, it is true, appears the man of letters rather than the man of science, but still it is the man of letters of first rank ; and that is always his position except where he travels beyond his sphere. Comparative mythology belongs at present to the domain of Belles Lettres rather than to that of science, and the discovery that M. de Belloguet has given great attention to it excites no surprise. He attempts to apply some of the principles of comparative mythology to the religion of the Druids. But, inasmuch as both the Druids and comparative mythology are very large subjects, we are quite unable to discuss them in a review which has already grown to a considerable length. We have only to remark, that we fear less is known about the Druids from trustworthy sources than M. de Belloguet supposes, but that, in spite of all its faults, his work is very interesting and even valuable by reason of the mass of facts which he has brought together.
